



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/181,402	10/28/1998	MARK J. BEACH	RO998-106	9872

23123 7590 06/05/2002

SCHMEISER OLSEN & WATTS
18 E UNIVERSITY DRIVE
SUITE # 101
MESA, AZ 85201

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/181,402

Applicant(s)

BEACH, MARK J.

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-49 are presented for examination. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 3-11-2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (5,826,031) in view of Cash et al (5,481,312).

Regarding claim 1, Nielsen discloses that the claimed feature of an apparatus (See Abstract, Fig 1) comprising

- a) at least one processor (See Fig 1)
- b) a memory coupled to the at least one processor (See Fig 1)
- c) an prioritized graphics file residing in the memory, the prioritized graphics file defining higher priority image transmission portions and lower priority image transmission portions that have been selected and assigned priorities such that when the prioritized graphics file is transferred across a network, the higher priority image

transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file are transmitted before the lower priority image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file. (See Fig 1, Abstract, col 1 line 51-57)

Nielsen does not specifically disclose that "a prioritized graphics file". However, Nielsen discloses "a web page", which includes a web objects (e.g. graphics file) and a web file. (See col 1 line 20-23, col 1 line 39-col 2 line 23) The motivation would have been to retrieve more important objects faster than less important objects, as disclosed in Nielsen. (See col 1 line 58-63) The high ranked web object (e.g. graphics file) can be considered as higher priority portions of single file of web page, and the low ranked web objects can be considered as lower priority portions of web page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have "a prioritized graphics file" in the teaching of Nielsen.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that a single prioritized graphics file, which contains higher priority image transmission portions and lower priority image transmission portions. However, Cash et al discloses that method of transmitting a video bitstream["a prioritized graphics file"], which includes a plurality of high priority segments["higher priority image transmission portions"] and low priority segments["lower priority image transmission portions"]. (See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67) It would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Nielsen and Cash et al, because the teachings/suggestions in

Nielsen (See Abstract, col 1 line 39-50) regarding of "a web object may be, but is not limited to, text, a graphical user interface element, an image file, an audio file, an applet, or other computer code. "Acting on" the information element typically includes, but is not limited to, displaying the text, displaying the graphical user interface element, displaying the image file..." , would provide the motivation to have prioritized transmitting/receiving for a single graphic with differently ranked image data, in order to retrieve/render more important objects faster than less important objects, as disclosed in Nielsen. (See col 1 line 58-63) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Cash et al into the teaching of Nielsen.

Regarding claim 2, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Nielsen discloses that a receiving computer receiving image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file, the receiving computer comprising an image interpreter and an image viewer residing on the receiving computer, the image interpreter translating the received image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file into image data, such that the image viewer can display the higher priority image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file before displaying the lower priority image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file. (See Abstract, Fig 1, col 1 line 51-57; Also See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67 in Cash)

The combination of Nielsen and Cash et al do not explicitly disclose that “an image interpreter”. However, the image interpreter is inherent by the web browser in order to display the received image file on the display device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have “image interpreter” in the teaching of Nielsen.

Regarding claim 3, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Nielsen discloses that an image prioritization editor residing in the memory, the image prioritization editor allowing at least one image transmission portion of the prioritized graphics file to be selected and assigned at least one priority. (See Abstract, Fig 1, col 1 line 51-57, col 6 line 13-23; Also See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67 in Cash)

Regarding claim 4, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Nielsen discloses that the [image interpreter] saving the prioritized graphics file in a prioritized graphics file format. (See Abstract, Fig 1, col 1 line 51-57; Also See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67 in Cash)

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that “image interpreter”. However, the image interpreter is inherent by the web browser in order for the server computer to store the

Art Unit: 2672

image files in the proper format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have "image interpreter" in the teaching of Nielsen.

Regarding claim 5, refer to the discussion for the claims 1 and 4, Nielsen discloses that the prioritized graphics file format comprises joint picture experts group format, graphics interchange format, or bitmap format. (See Abstract, Fig 1; Also See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67 in Cash)

Regarding claim 6, refer to the discussion for the claim 1 hereinabove, Nielsen discloses that the prioritized graphics file format comprises a plurality of image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file, each image transmission portion corresponding to the at least one priority. (See Abstract, Fig 1, col 6 line 13-23; Also See Abstract, Fig 1-6, col 1 line 40-67 in Cash)

Regarding claim 7, Nielsen discloses that a simulation browser residing in the memory, the simulation browser simulating transmission and reception of the prioritized graphics file, the simulation browser adding a delay between image transmission portions of the prioritized graphics file. (See Abstract, Fig 1, col 1 line 39-col 2 line 24)

Regarding claim 8, claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1 and 2, and thus the rejections to claims 1 and 2 hereinabove are also applicable to claim 8.

Regarding claims 9-13, claims 9-13 are respectively equivalent to claims 3-7, and thus the rejections to claims 3-7 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 9-13, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 8.

Regarding claims 14-16, claims 14-16 are similar in scope to claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claims 14-16.

In addition, Nielsen discloses that signal bearing media bearing the image interpreter wherein the signal bearing media comprises transmission media or recordable media. (See Abstract, Fig 1)

Nielsen does not specifically disclose that "transmission media" and "recordable media". However, those are inherent in order for the server computer to store or transmit the image files. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have "transmission media" or "recordable media" into the teaching of Nielsen.

Regarding claims 17-22, claims 17-22 are respectively equivalent to claims 2-7, and thus the rejections to claims 2-7 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 17-22, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 14.

Regarding claim 23, claim 23 is the corresponding program product of claims 14 and 17. Thus, the rejections to claims 14 and 17 hereinabove are also applicable to claim 23.

Regarding claims 24-30, claims 24-30 are respectively equivalent to claims 15-22, and thus the rejections to claims 15-22 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 24-30, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 23.

Regarding claim 31, claim 31 is the corresponding method of claim 1. Thus, the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 31.

Regarding claims 32-34, claims 32-34 are respectively equivalent to claims 4-6, and thus the rejections to claims 4-6 hereinabove are also respectively applicable to claims 32-34, but applied in view of the rejections to base claim 31.

Regarding claim 35-36 and 38-40, claim 35-36 and 38-40 are similar in scope to claims 8, 13 and 10-12. Thus, the rejections to claims 8,13 and 10-12 hereinabove are also applicable to claim 35-36 and 38-40.

Regarding claim 37, Nielsen discloses that the step of translating the portion of the image file into image data further comprises that step of decompressing the portion of the image file. (See Abstract, Fig 1)

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that "decompressing". However, decompressing is inherent in order to decompress the compressed image data for displaying. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have "decompressing" into the teaching of Nielsen.

Regarding claims 41-49, claims 41-49 are similar in scope to the claim 5, and thus the rejection to claim 5 hereinabove is also applicable to claims 41-49.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2672

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-3419. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am- 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael, Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Application/Control Number: 09/181,402
Art Unit: 2672

Page 11

djc
May 22, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew Luu', with a large, stylized initial 'M' and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER